ಇನ್ನು (೩) ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ "ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆ ಹಾಗೂ ದುರಸ್ತಿಗಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯ ನಿಧಿ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭಾವ ಪೀಡಿತ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳ ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆಯು ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ವಿಂತಿಗೊಳಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ೪೫೫ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ರಾಜ್ಯನಿಧಿ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಬಿ. ಜಕನೂರು.—ತಮ್ಮ ವಿನಂತಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬಿ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.— ಕೆಲವು ರಸ್ತೆಗಳು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಕೆಟ್ಟುಹೋಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅರ್ಧದಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಬಿ. ಜಕನೂರು.—ಈ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬರಗಾಲ ಬಂದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರಗೂ ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು ದುರಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಈ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯು.ಡಿ ನವರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸುವಂತೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರ್‌ರವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ೨೧೫ ಕಿಲೋಮೀಟರ್ ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬಿ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೇಗಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ೫೦ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಬಿ. ಜಕನೂರು.—ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Advocate General of Karnataka T.A. D.A. and other allowances.

308. SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM (K.G.F.)— Will the Minister for Law, Social Welfare and Backward Classes be pleased to state :—

(a) the number of cases in which the Adovacate-General of Karnataka appeared on behalf of Government before the High Court and the Supreme Court and Commission both at Bangalore and Delhi for the last 3 years ;

(b) whether in such cases any other advocate was appointed to assist him, and if so, the name of such advocate and the cases in which they were engaged ;

(c) the number of cases won, lost and compromised ;

(d) the T.A. D.A., fees and other allowances claimed by the Advocate General for each case and the total amount thus claimed for the last 3 years ;

(e) the total spent like boarding, lodging, T.A., D.A., and fees on other advocates who assisted or helped the Advocate-General in the cases before the High Court, Supreme Court and before any Commission for the last 3 years ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR (Minister for Law, Social Welfare and Backward Classes).—

Before High Court		Before Supreme Court		Before Commission	
(a)—					
	Nos.		Nos.		
1976	579	1976	375	1976	Nil
1977	47	1977	1	1977	1 (Grover's Commission)
1978	119	1978	1	1978	1 (Shah Commission)
Total	745	Total	377	Total	2

(b) No body assisted the Advocate-General except the standing Counsel of our State at Supreme Court.

(c)—

I. Won		I. Won	
1976	129	1976	375
1977	23	1977	...
1978	84	1978	...
Total	236	Total	375
II. Lost		*II. Lost*	
1976	450	1976	Nil
1977	12	1977	1
1978	30	1978	Nil
Total	492	Total	1

DOES NOT ARISE

III. Compromised NIL		*III. Compromised* NIL	
IV. Otherwise/ Diposed off		*IV. Otherwise/ Diposed off*	
1976	...	1976	Nil
1977	12	1977	Nil
1978	5	1978	1
Total	17	Total	1

(d) Reply Laid on table. **

(e) Does not arise.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— Sir, I am not able to follow the list, My question is whether you could give me yearwise details i.e. the retainer fees and other charges that he claimed on each case both in the High Court and in the Supreme court for the last three years. I want to know the total amount claimed by the Adocate General, the amount sanctioned and the amount yet to be sanctioned by Government ?

† SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— The hon. Member did not ask about the amount of retainer fees the Advocate General got all these years. In respect of the yearwise fees, T.A., D.A. and other things the information is laid on the table. The hon. Member could have access to that information.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— You have given some figures. I cannot total it. Just now they have come to me and they are not clear also. The total amount is not mentioned. Then there is a Writ Petition No. 8461 of 1976 for which he has claimed Rs. 15,000. What is that writ petition ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— That means writ petition No. 8461 of 1976 and other connected cases. It is not Rs. 15,000 for a single case.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— I have asked for the total amout of T.A., D.A. and other allowances claimed for the last three years. The total amount is not given in the list.

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— I shall total it up here itself and give the hon. Member the information.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— The statement is confusing. The purpose in asking the question is what is the total emoluments claimed by him ?

(No reply)

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— During the last three years may I know whether any senior Advocates of the Supreme Court of High Court were engaged in any of these cases ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— The answer is specific to the hon. Member's specific question viz. 'no'.

** Copy placed in the Karnataka Legislatures Library *vide* No. 41/Dated 26-5-1979.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— May I know the number of standing Counsels who assisted him in the Supreme Court and their emoluments for the last three years ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— There are two standing Counsels. The hon. Member may put a separate question about their emoluments.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— It is stated that in 1976 the number of cases in which he appeared before the Karnataka High Court is 579 and the number of cases in which he appeared before the Supreme Court is 375. Is it possible for him to appear in so many cases in the Supreme Court and High Court in one year ? In how many cases he appeared before the High Court in a day and is it possible for him to appear before the High Court and the Supreme Court simultaneously. Does this appearance denote the number of days or the number of cases ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— It is physically impossible for anyone to be present simultaneously here at Bangalore and in the Supreme Court at Delhi. It seems that some connected cases were disposed of by the High Court and in all the cases separate appeal numbers are given. It is the aggregate number of the connected cases which make 375.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— In 1976 the number of cases lost in the High Court was 450. In these cases did the Government go in appeal to the Supreme Court in that year ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR — The hon. Member did not seek information relating to which particular case we lost in the High Court. If he had asked the particular case in which we lost and whether we had preferred an appeal or not, I would have given the information.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— I am asking about the cases you have lost. Is it that you have not preferred an appeal ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— I am not at all confused Sometimes you feel you got confused by my answers.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.— In respect of Grover commission a sum of Rs. 25,000 is claimed. May I know how many times he has appeared before this Commission ?

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.— The hon. member is a senior member and he knows that for a specific answer he should put a specific question.